



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,986	06/20/2001	Masanori Umeda	32011-173213	5656

7590 09/20/2005

VENABLE
Post Office Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,986

Applicant(s)

UMEDA, MASANORI

Examiner

Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on June 24, 2005 has been entered. No claims have been amended. Claims 1-20 have been canceled. Claims 21-39 have been added. Claims 21-39 are pending in this application, with claim 21 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrey et al. (US PAT # 6,539,232) in view of Fujino et al. (US PAT # 6,621,894).

Regarding claim 21, Hendrey teaches a call connection management equipment for a wireless mobile communication network (see col. 2, lines 38-44 ad Fig.1), comprising: connection setter adapted to generate call connection information to perform call connection between an interface and another interface on a communication route (connection setter reads on connection server 108, see col. 5, lines 46-52 and col. 2, lines 60-67. Also, having the interface is obvious); connection register to store said call connection information (this is done in server 105, see col. 8, lines 17-20); a history storage to store call connection histories for each combination of the calling and called

Art Unit: 2642

terminal IDS (see col. 16, lines 24-32); a comparator configured to compare said call connection history with a predetermined condition (this may read on the matchmaker server 107 and its components, see col. 9, lines 16-26 and col. 10, lines 4-10), and judge whether a call connection history satisfies the predetermined condition (this basically reads on establishing the call when the matchmaking found. Matchmaker 107 matches the information to a certain attribute profiles stored in database. Matching the information must be performed based on those "attribute" conditions, see col. 9, lines 16-25); and a connection establisher adapted to establishes a call connection between said interface and said other interface based on said call connection information stored in said connection register when corresponding combination of the calling and the called terminal Ids is stored in history storage and said cal connection history satisfies the predetermined condition.

Hendery does not exactly teach establishing call connection between said interface and said other interface based on connection information newly generated by said connection setting means when said call connection history does not satisfy the predetermined condition. Henry does not also teach storing the combination of calling terminal ID and corresponding called terminal ID.

However, Fujino teaches a caller ID detection circuit detects a caller ID that is given at the time of a call reception by a caller ID notification service that is provided by a telephone company. If reception history information having the same

Art Unit: 2642

caller ID as the detected caller ID is stored in a reception history memory, the number of times of call reception in the reception history information is incremented by one. If no reception history information having the same caller ID as the detected caller ID is stored in the reception history memory, new reception history information having the detected caller ID is generated and additionally stored in the reception history memory (see abstract). Fujino also teaches storing history for each combination of a calling terminal and a called terminal (see col. 5, lines 44-50, see Fig. 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a call connection established based on a new line of history information, as taught by Fujino, into the Hendrey system in order to enhance the probability of making the call connection successfully in the event of call connection failure based on the previous history information.

Regarding claims 22-23 and 25-26, Hendrey teaches the interface is a wireless base station and the other interface is another wireless base station (this reads on wireless links 110, see telecommunication links 111 within system 120, i.e. wireless, col. 5, lines 36-40).

Claim 24 recites "other interface is a gateway switch for connecting said wireless mobile communication network and another communication network". Hendery does not exactly teach the call connection established between wireless mobile

Art Unit: 2642

communication network and another communication network. However, setting up a call connection between two different networks is obvious and well known in the art. Therefore, having a gateway to communicate between those different networks is obvious.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 24.

Claim 28 recites "said interface and said other interface are ATM interfaces". Hendery doesn't not exactly teach the interfaces are an ATM interfaces. However, examiner takes an official notice that ATM interfaces are a common kind of interfaces known in the art.

Regarding claim 29, Fujino teaches deleting the registration of said connection information when said call connection history is judged as not satisfying the predetermined condition (Fujino teaches that user may delete the information if desired, see col. 6, lines 45-57).

Claims 30-35 recite "said connection registration means deletes the registration of said connection information when said interface to accommodate the calling terminal is switched or a wireless base station to accommodate the calling terminal is switched". This basically reads deleting or changing the current information in the event of

Art Unit: 2642

unsuccessful call connection scenarios when the device is turned off or unable to locate or reach a specified base station for example. In both scenarios this is logical because there is no need to exhaust the network by trying to make another call attempt to a non- available destination. Generally, when any component or device is switched off information history will be erased since this information has to be updated and replaces with a current status/data of information.

Regarding claim 36, Fujino teaches said call connection history is a connection count between said calling terminal and said called terminal (see Fig. 5 also, col. 2, lines 39-48).

Claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 36.

Regarding claim 38, Hendrey teaches said call connection history is a type of service used for communication between said calling terminal and said called terminal (this reads on matchmaker service, see col. 9, lines 11-15).

Regarding claim 39, Hendrey teaches said call connection history is a distance between said calling terminal and said called terminal (see col. 9, lines 31-37).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 8 of the Remarks "Fujino et al. makes no mention of and do not teach, disclose or suggest establishing a cal connection based on newly generated call connection information when the call information stored...". Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant argument for the following reason, Fujino specifically teach the ability of receiving and storing a new reception information history that might overwrite an old information history (col. 2, lines 27-35). Thus, establishing a call connection can be preformed based on "new" reception history information that is stored in memory.

Applicants also ads "Fujino et al. simply counting the number of times calls from a particular caller have been received". Examiner would like to bring to applicant's attention that "counting the number of times calls from a particular caller" is not the only limitation taught in Fujino. Actually, it is one of so many other teachings taught in the Fujino reference.

Examiner believes that all other arguments are already addressed in the above rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2642

272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Examiner
Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi
Art Unit 2642
09/16/2005